October 12, 2020

Ken Lyons Designated Broker, Realtor® Boardwalk Real Estate LLC 17533 47th Ave NE Seattle, WA 98155

Site: 345 Mine Hill Road SW

Issaquah, WA

TPN: 3324069039, 3324069036

Total acreage: 4.9

Re: RFI dated June 2020 and ongoing conversations with Issaquah planning department

This report reflects the changes in grading, buffer averaging, and specific instructions for tree management to obtain the City of Issaquah's required 30% tree retention requirement. The spreadsheet documenting the information from the Tree Risk Assessment has also been updated to adhere to the City of Issaquah code more closely. The following changes have been made to the Tree Risk Assessment spreadsheet:

- 1. I updated the adjust DBH of the multi-stemmed trees to City of Issaquah requirements (DBH of trunks are added together rather than taking the square root of the sum of the squared DBH of each trunk). Consequently, the adjusted DBH of the following trees changed: (231, 240, 241, 242, 243, 259, 279, 280, 281, 291, 292, 293, 295, 320, 343, 367, 268, 372, 373, 374, 376, 377, 380, 573).
- 2. I removed the column labelled "nonviable trees". These were trees that without major intervention would be declining to an extent that they were not likely to live into the next decade. The classification of trees in this manner did not address code requirement of distinguishing between living and hazardous trees. On the June 26th, 2020 report I considered 50 trees to be "non-viable" and 42 trees to be hazardous.
 - In removing the non-viable column, I applied the City of Issaquah's as well as the ISA definition of a "hazard tree". To be considered a "Hazard" that tree, if it were to fail, would endanger live or property. Only thirteen (13) additional trees met the definition and were moved from the "non-viable "column to "hazardous "column. The remaining 37 trees (if they could be pruned or cabled to improve their probability of survival) were considered "viable"
- 3. Trees located in critical area that were inadvertently shown as being onsite were removed from the spreadsheet (trees #17, 18, 19, 325, 344, 347, 355, 357, 358, 359); and trees 898 & 899 previously shown in critical area are now shown in onsite trees, so the Hazardous tree number increased from 55 to 57 total.
- 4. Grading was modified to be able to retain six (6) additional trees: (354, 307, 338, 340, 305, 306).
- 5. I upgraded the health of four (4) trees from "hazardous" to retained after the second Tract "C" was added on adjacent to Lot 4 and the trees no longer had a target. These trees will need to be pruned, and ivy removed under the supervision of an ISA certified arborist after grading.
- 6. I added the City of Issaquah's definition of a Hazardous tree
- 7. For each tree that I assessed as being a hazard; in the defects/comment section of the spreadsheet, I added a short description of how the tree met the code criteria for being a hazard. The information is in red type.

This following is a summary of the changes between the June 26th, 2020 arborist report and this one:

Tree Density Calculation		
	06.26.20	10.02.20
Total number of trees	158	149
Total number of hazard trees	42	57
Total number of significant trees	66	94
Total number of retained trees proposed	19	30
Total number of tree credits	2498	1983
Total viable tree credits	1522	1983
Tree density (1522 * .15)	375	
Required tree density (1983*.30)		594
Total number of retained tree credits proposed	377	596
Required mitigation	0	0

I have included a detailed report of my findings, changes from the original submittal have been highlighted in yellow. If you have any questions please contact me. I can be reached on my cell phone: 425.890.3808 or by email: sprince202@aol.com.

Warm regards,

Susan Prince

Creative Landscape Solutions ISA Certified Arborist #1481 TRAQ Certified Arborist #481 Landscape Designer

Susan R

June 26, 2020

Ken Lyons

Designated Broker, Realtor®
Boardwalk Real Estate LLC
17533 47th Ave NE
Seattle, WA 98155

Site: 345 Mine Hill Road SW

Issaguah, WA

TPN: 3324069039, 3324069036

Total acreage: 4.9

Dear Ken:

Thank you for requesting my services. On June 27, 2016, I performed a Visual Risk Assessment (VRA) for all the significant* trees growing on the site above, as well as the offsite and ROW trees with canopies that included coverage on the property.

The information gathered and included in this report is a necessary part of the of the redevelopment process which requires that a Tree Retention Plan to be submitted as part of a proposed site development (IMC 18.12.1385).

In summary:

Tree Density Calculation	
	10.02.20
Total number of trees counted outside critical areas	149
Total number of hazard trees	55
Total number of significant trees	94
Total number of retained trees proposed	30
Total number of tree credits	1978
Required tree density (1983*.30)	594
Total number of retained tree credits proposed	596
Required mitigation	0

I have included a detailed report of my findings, if you have any questions please contact me. I can be reached on my cell phone: 425.890.3808 or by email: sprince202@aol.com.

Warm regards,

Susan Prince

Creative Landscape Solutions ISA Certified Arborist #1481 TRAQ Certified Arborist #481 Landscape Designer

425.890.3808

*The City of Issaquah defines a significant tree as an existing healthy tree which, when measured four- and one-half feet above grade, has a minimum diameter of:

- 6" for evergreen trees and most deciduous or
- 8" for alder or cottonwood trees
- Landmark tree DBH > 30" (18.12.030)

Personal qualifications, scope of work and methodology:

To evaluate the trees and prepare the report, I drew on my formal college education in botany and the preparation and training used to obtain my ISA certification. In addition to my education and certification, I relied heavily on my training to obtain my certification as a Tree Risk Assessor. I have been worked in arboriculture since 1995 and been an ISA Certified Arborist since 1999. I have been TRACE/TRAQ qualified since 2009.

I followed protocol delineated by the International Society of Arboriculture (ISA) for Visual Risk Assessment (VRA). By doing so, I am examining each tree independently as well as collectively as groups or stands of trees provide stability and can lower risk of independent tree failure. This scientific process examines tree health (e.g. size, vigor, and insect and disease process) as well as site conditions (soil moisture and composition, quantity of impervious surfaces surrounding the tree etc.)

Method's used to determine tree location and tree health:

Trees were identified previously by numbered aluminum tags attached to the western side of the tree. All the trees on site were examined using the Matheny and $Clark^1$ criteria for determining the potential hazard of trees in an urban environment as well as the Tree Risk Assessment in Urban Areas and The Urban/Rural Interface by Julian Dunster². Tree diameters were measured using a logger's tape, and tree driplines were measured in four directions if necessary, by a Nikon Forestry PRO Laser RangefinderTM.

ABBREVIATED LEGEND- SEE REPORT FOR GREATER DETAIL

- 1. Numerical ordering
- 2. Tree tag #: numbered aluminum tags attached to the trees in the field
- 3. Tree species ID: common and botanical names
 - Apple: Malus sp.
 - American sycamore: *Plantanus* occidentalis
 - Austrian pine: Pinus nigra
 - Bigleaf maple: Acer macrophyllum
 - Birch: Betula nigra
 - Bitter Cherry: Prunus emarginata
 - Blue atlas cedar: Cedrus atlantica 'Glauca'
 - Cedar: Thuja plicata
 - Cherry: Prunus sp.
 - Dawn redwood: *Chamaecyparis* nootkatensis
 - Deodora cedar: Cedrus deodara
 - Colorado blue spruce: *Picea pungens*
 - Cottonwood: Populus trichocarpa
 - Dogwood: Cornus nuttallii
 - Douglas fir: *Pseudotsuga menziesii*
 - English laurel: *Prunus laurocerasus*

- Filbert: Corylus avellana var.
- Grand fir: Abies grandis
- Hemlock: Tsuga hetrophylla
- Holly: Ilex aquifolium
- Japanese maple: Acer palmatum
- Leylandii cypress: Cupressocyparis leylandii
- Lodgepole pine: Pinus contorta
- Mountain ash: Sorbus americana
- Mountain hemlock: *Tsuga* mertensiana
- Pear: Pyrus sp.
- Plum: Prunus
- Red Alder: Alnus rubra
- Red maple: Acer rubrum
- Walnut: Juglans sp.
- Western red cedar: Thuja plicata
- Weeping Alaska cedar:
 Metasequoia glyptostrobides
- White pine: Pinus strobus
- 4. DBH: diameter of the tree measured in inches at 4' above grade
- 5. Adj. DBH: multiple trunk tree DBH in inches calculated per municipality directives
- 6. Dripline Radius: measurement in feet of the tree canopy from tree trunk to outermost branch tip via laser rangefinder
- 7. Windfirm: whether the tree is not protected by other structures of trees remains windfirm
- 8. Health: a measurement of overall tree vigor and vitality rated as excellent, good, OK, fair or poor based on an assessment of crown density, leaf color and size, active callusing, shoot growth rate, extent of crown dieback, cambium layer health, and tree age
 - Excellent: Tree is an ideal specimen for the species with no obvious flaws
 - Good: Tree has minimal structural or situational defects

- OK: Minimal structural issues with poor
- Fair: Tree has structural or health issues that predispose it to failure if further stressed but can be retained in a grove of 3 or more trees
- Poor: Tree has significant structural and/or health issues. It is exempt from total tree count.
- 9. Defects/Concerns: a measure of the tree's structural stability and failure potential based on assessment of specific structural features, e.g., decay, conks, co-dominant trunks, included bark, abnormal lean, one-sided canopy, history of failure, prior construction impact, pruning history, etc.
- 10. Proposed actions:
 - Retain
 - Remove due to planned development (tree is otherwise healthy)
 - Hazardous: A hazardous tree is one that is so affected by a significant structural defect or
 disease or in permanent decline that falling or failure appears imminent, and that
 otherwise currently poses a threat to life or property and the risk of failure per the most
 recent adopted ISA standard tree risk assessment evaluation must be rated greater than
 or equal to "high" as measured on the tree risk assessment form. (IMC 18.12.030)
- 11. Limits of disturbance/Tree protection zone: the area surrounding the tree that defines the area that surrounds the trunk that cannot be encroached upon during construction. This may be a multiple of the trunk diameter (1 -1.5 times the trunk diameter converted to feet) or it may be related to the width of the canopy. It is always determined by tree species and environment and is up to the discretion of the ISA Certified Arborist to determine
- 12. Measure of tree "value" may be determined by municipality formula or a direct measure of the trunk diameter, or a numerical count to determine significance; also included on the status of the tree determined by the City to designate exceptional sized or species trees (not always present)

Specific Tree Observations:

1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
							a				osed A	ction		CRZ/TF Radius			d)	alue	Value	dmark
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	grove			Via	ble						alue	>	BH	-anc
#	Tag #	ID ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in g	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
1	216	Norway spruce	13	13	8			Poor	Asymmetric canopy to east, dead wood, broken branches, dying *effected by structural defect			1	8	8	8	8	0			NS
2	217	Western red cedar	35	35	11			ОК	Column of decay on north@ root crown up to 4', typical of species		1		11	11	11	11	35	35		L
3	218	Lodgepole Pine	15	15	9			OK	Dead wood, broken branches, asymmetric canopy to east		1		9	9	9	9	15	15		S
4	219	Catalpa	33	33	24			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 5', typical of species		1		24	24	24	24	33	33		L
5	220	Douglas fir	18	18	14			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 20', dead wood, broken branches, not much live tissue		1		14	14	14	14	18	18		S
6	221	Douglas fir	16	16	12			Fair	Asymmetric canopy to north, dead wood, broken branches, not much live tissue, OK in grove		1		12	12	12	12	16	16		S
7	222	Douglas fir	16	16	14			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 20', dead wood, broken branches, thin canopy*effected by structural defect			1	14	14	14	14	0			NS
8	223	Douglas fir	13	13	16			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 15', taps hollow, asymmetric canopy to NE, previous top loss, dead wood, broken branches, thin canopy * *effected by structural defect			1	16	16	16	16	0			NS

1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD	l			a	¥
							0)			РГОР	oseu A	CUOII		Radius	in feet			alue	/alu	lmar
	Tree	Charios	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	rove			Via	ble						alue	Ν̈́	BH \	-and
#	Tag #	Species ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
9	224	Incense cedar* ^{1,2}	15	15	13			Poor	Dead wood, broken branches, dead tissue, ivy @ root crown up to 20', typical of species grown in shade, asymmetric canopy to west, thin canopy *symptomatic of a dying cedar - diseas			1	13	13	13	13	0			NS
10	229	Douglas fir	45	45	16			ОК	Carpenter ants bark only, previous top loss, typical of species		1		16	16	16	16	45	45		L
11	230	Douglas fir	39	39	16			OK	Typical of species, previous top loss, dead wood, broken branches		1		16	16	16	16	39	39		L
12	231	Bigleaf maple	14, 16, 40	70	26			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, multi failures, cavity on NE *Multiple large scaffolds have already failed*effected by structural defect			1	26	26	26	26	0			NS
13	234	Cedar variety	7.5	7.5	7		Yes	Fair	Lean to SW, typical of species		1		7	7	7	7	7.5	7.5		S
14	235	Bigleaf maple	9	9	14			Fair	Moss and lichen, serpentine trunk, lean to north		1		14	14	14	14	9	9		S
15	236	Bigleaf maple	20	20	19			ОК	Dead wood, dead scaffold, moss and lichen		1		19	19	19	19	20	20		S
16	237	Western red cedar	10.5	10.5	10			Good	Typical of species, self- corrected lean to south		1		10	10	10	10	10.5	10.5		S
17	238	Bitter cherry	7.5	7.5	10			ОК	Asymmetric canopy to east, typical of species, moss and lichen		1		10	10	10	10	7.5	7.5		S
18	239	Alder	14	14	10			Poor	Mostly dead, cavity on west @ root crown, lean to east, low live crown ratio - 10%, woodpecker activity *Mostly dead - effected by structural defect			1	10	10	10	10	0			NS

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD	ı			a	¥
							a			гтор	USEU AI	LIOII		Radius	in feet		a ,	alue	/alu	Imai
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	Jrove			Via	ble						alue	Ν̈́	ВН \	Lanc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
19	240	Bigleaf maple	38, 30	68	30			Poor	Exposed roots, hypoxylon canker, carpenter ants, cavity @ root crown up to 14', failing, co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 *Hypoxylon canker is a fatal disease, disease			1	30	30	30	30	0			NS
20	241	Western red cedar	13, 4, 5	22	7			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, typical of species		1		7	7	7	7	22	22		S
21	242	Bigleaf maple	18, 17, 16	51	21			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, moss and lichen, typical of species		1		21	21	21	21	51	51		S
22	243	Western red cedar	17, 36	53	13			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 3', column of decay on east @ root crown up to 9', typical of species		1		13	13	13	13	53	53		L
23	244	Western red cedar	13	13	10	Not		Poor	Asymmetric canopy to west, typical of species, OK in grove, * tree is not windfirm			1	10	10	10	10	0			NS
24	245	Bigleaf maple	21	21	19			Fair	Cavity @ root crown up to 5' on west, lean to east, dead spur * Large cavity of decay, structural defect			1	19	19	19	19	0			NS
25	246	Western red cedar	13	13	6			Good	Exposed roots, typical of species		1		6	6	6	6	13	13		S
26	247	Bigleaf maple	25	25	20			ОК	Moss and lichen, dead wood, typical of species		1		20	20	20	20	25	25	_	S
27	248	Bitter cherry	6	6	15			Poor	Typical of species, moss and lichen, failing to south, taps hollow *short lived tree that is hollow from decay in heartwood, structural defect			1	15	15	15	15	0			NS
28	249	Bitter cherry	8	8	9			ОК	Broken branches, moss and lichen, typical of species, dead scaffold		1		9	9	9	9	8	8		S

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed Ad	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD	1			Ψ.	÷
							0)			РГОР	oseu A	LUOII		Radius	in feet			alue	/alu	lmar
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	Irove			Via							Value	DBH Value	BH \	-anc
#	Tag #	ID ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	Ν	W	E	S	л наа	Viable DB	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
29	250	Bigleaf maple	41	41	20			ОК	Twisted trunks, typical of species, multi failures, decay @ root crown		1		20	20	20	20	41	41		L
30	251	Western red cedar	66	66	16			ОК	Carpenter ants, woodpecker activity, exposed roots, typical of species, broken branches, old tree fort, remove old fort		1		16	16	16	16	66	66		L
31	252	Western red cedar	70	70	17			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ 5', typical of species		1		17	17	17	17	70	70		L
32	253	Western red cedar	6	6	10			ОК	Typical of species		1		10	10	10	10	6	6		S
33	254	Western red cedar	6	6	10			Fair	Girdled by rope @ 4', vandalized, typical of species, all can be saved with #252		1		10	10	10	10	6	6		S
34	255	Western red cedar	6	6	10			Poor	Typical of species, vandalized, bark stripped *Tree was vandalized, and bark was removed from circumference, tree will not survive structural defect			1	10	10	10	10	0			NS
35	256	Alder	12	12	12			Poor	Failing to east *Actively falling - hazard			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS
36	257	Bigleaf maple	9	9	11			ОК	Asymmetric canopy to east, moss and lichen, typical of species		1		11	11	11	11	9	9		S
37	258	Bigleaf maple	9.5	9.5	12			OK	Typical of species, asymmetric canopy to south, exposed roots		1		12	12	12	12	9.5	9.5		S
38	259	Bigleaf maple	9, 9	12.5	17			Fair	Taps hollow, co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 4', decay @ 4'		1		17	17	17	17	12.5	12.5		S
39	260	Bigleaf maple	13	13	14			ОК	Moss and lichen, typical of species, dead wood, broken branches		1		14	14	14	14	13	13		S

1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
	_			_						Pron	osed Ad	rtion		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD				a	논
							Φ			ттор	oseu A	20011		Radius	in feet		a)	DBH Value	Valu	Imai
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	Jrov			Via	ble						alue	Ν̈́	ВН	Lanc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	Ν	W	E	S	DBH Value	Viable DB	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
40	261	Bigleaf maple	8	8	9			Poor	Ivy @ root crown up to 25', mostly dead * Small diameter BLM girdled and choked by ivy, not survivable,			1	9	9	9	9	0			NS
41	262	Bigleaf maple	14	14	17			ОК	Typical of species, moss and lichen, asymmetric canopy to north		1		17	17	17	17	14	14		S
42	263	Alder	10	10	12			Poor	Moss and lichen, failing to north * tree falling hazard			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS
43	264	Bigleaf maple	11	11	16			OK	Typical of species, asymmetric canopy to north		1		16	16	16	16	11	11		S
44	265	Bigleaf maple	14	14	16			Fair	Serpentine trunk, dead wood, dead scaffold, typical of species*upright tree with multiple failures leading to a serpentine trunk structure, at high risk of failure -structural defect			1	16	16	16	16	0			NS
45	266	Bigleaf maple	9	9	10			Fair	Self-corrected lean to north, moss and lichen, previous top loss, dead wood, OK in grove		1		10	10	10	10	9	9		S
46	267	Bitter cherry	11	11	8			OK	Typical of species, dead wood, broken branches, previous top loss		1		8	8	8	8	11	11		S
47	268	Alder	16	16	10			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 25', column of decay on east @ root crown up to 8', dead wood, dead scaffold, moss and lichen		1		10	10	10	10	16	16		S
48	269	Bitter cherry	11	11	7			ОК	Typical of species, hanger, dead wood, broken branches, exposed roots		1		7	7	7	7	11	11		S
49	270	Bigleaf maple	10	10	10			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 30', low live crown ratio - 10%		1		10	10	10	10	10	10		S

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	otion		CRZ/TI	PZ/LOD)			(I)	×
							<i>a</i> ,			РГОР	oseu A	LUOII		Radius	in feet	:		lue	alu(mar
	Tree			Adj.	Drip-	Ē	OVE			Via	ble						lue	ı Va	<u> </u>	and
#	Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	DBH (in)	line radius (ft)	muind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	E	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
50	271	Bigleaf maple	9	9	11			OK	Low live crown ratio - 10%, typical of species, OK in grove		1		11	11	11	11	9	9		S
51	272	Bigleaf maple	15	15	14			Fair	Typical of species, slime flux * weeping sap, secondary slime flux - diease			1	14	14	14	14	0			NS
52	273	Bigleaf maple	11	11	19 east only	No		OK	Asymmetric canopy to east, typical of species		1		0	0	19	0	11	11		s
53	274	Ash	10	10	0			Poor	Failing to east * falling from soil failure equals eminent high risk			1	0	0	0	0	0			NS
54	275	Bitter cherry	16	16	16			Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 6', large wound calloused @ 4' on south, gall @ 6' on north, gummosis, typical of species * internal decay in short-lived tree = imminent risk of failure-structural defect			1	16	16	16	16	0			NS
55	276	Bitter cherry	6	6	7			Fair	Serpentine trunk, self- corrected lean to south, co- dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 8'		1		7	7	7	7	6	6		S
56	277	Bitter cherry	6	6	6			ОК	Serpentine trunk, slight lean to south		1		6	6	6	6	6	6		S
57	278	Alder	8	8	10			Fair	Typical of species, dead scaffold, dead wood, moss and lichen		1		10	10	10	10	8	8		S
58	279	Bitter cherry	7, 7	14	9			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, typical of species, slight lean to north		1		9	9	9	9	14	14		S
59	280	Alder	7, 10, 12	29	10			Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, typical of species		1		10	10	10	10	29	29		S

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Prop	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	<u> </u>			4)	ne.	ž
					Duite	_	e e							Radius	in feet		ā	/alue	Valu	ıdma
#	Tree Tag	Species	DBH	Adj. DBH	Drip- line	Wind-firm	gro	Health	Defects/Comments	Via	ble ہے						Valu	BH \	DBH	:/Lar
"	#	ID	(in)	(in)	radius (ft)	Winc	OK in grove	ricalai		Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	w	E	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
									Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, exposed roots,											
60	281	Alder	8, 7	15	10			Poor	cavity @ 1' on west, vertical crack @ 5' and 7'			1	10	10	10	10	0			NS
00	201	Aldel	0, 7	13	10			POOI	on east trunk * large vertical crack makes this			1	10	10	10	10	U			N3
									susceptible to eminent											
									failure; structural defect Exposed roots, column of											
61	282	Alder	12	12	12			Fair	decay @ root crown up to 8' on south, typical of		1		12	12	12	12	12	12		S
									species Large wound @ root crown											
					_			_	up to 2' on south with decay * large cavity of				_		_	_				
62	283	Alder	8	8	7			Poor	decay in small DBH tree puts it at high risk of			1	7	7	7	7	0			NS
									failure disease, structural defect											
									Wound with decay @ 3' on west, dead wood, dead											
63	284	Alder	12	12	12			Fair	scaffold * short-lived tree with open wound and			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS
									decay makes this tree at high risk of failure											
-									structural defect Co-dominant leaders with											
64	288	Bigleaf	10	10	12			OK	included bark x2 @ 3', dead scaffold, dead wood,		1		12	12	12	12	10	10		S
		maple							typical of species, OK with pruning											
		Bigleaf							Asymmetric canopy to east, typical of species,											
65	289	maple	17	17	20			OK	moss and lichen, broken branches, dead wood		1		20	20	20	20	17	17		S

1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD)			υ	¥
							0			РГОР	osea A	LUOII		Radius	in feet			alue	/alu	mar
	Tree	Chasias	DBH	Adj.	Drip-	iirm	rove			Via	ble						Value	N H	3H \	-and
#	Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	DBH (in)	line radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	N HBQ	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
66	290	Bigleaf maple	73.5	73.5	30			Fair	Old tree fort, decay @ root crown, typical of species, dead scaffold, broken branches, dead wood, column of decay, cavity @ root crown, previous failures, OK in grove		1		30	30	30	30	73.5	73.5		L
67	291	Bigleaf maple	15, 8, 9	32	19			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, cavity @ 3', ivy @ root crown up to 40' *large hole in trunk at root crown, completely covered to top of tree with ivy. Not able to stand alone without intact ivy makes this an imminent risk of failure structural defect			1	19	19	19	19	0			NS
68	292	Bigleaf maple	24, 24	48	24			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, vertical crack @ root crown up to 15' *large crack in short-lived tree, puts this tree at high risk of failure in wet snow or wind, structural defect			1	24	24	24	24	0			NS
69	293	Ash	14, 6	20	9			Poor	Mostly dead * permanent decline			1	9	9	9	9	0			NS
70	295	Bigleaf maple	12, 20, 18	50	24			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, ivy @ root crown up to 40', column of decay @ root crown, lean to west, dead wood, broken branches, column of decay on north * tree supported by ivy, approximately 1/2 of the tree is dead, structural defect			1	24	24	24	24	0			NS

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Pron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD	l			e e	논
							a)			гтор	oseu A	CLIOII		Radius	in feet			DBH Value	/alu	Imai
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	in grove			Via	ble						alue	Ν̈́	ВН	Lanc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in g	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DB	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
71	297	Bigleaf maple	65	65	28			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 7', column of decay on west, hypoxylon canker * Hypoxylon canker - fatal disease,			1	28	28	28	28	0			NS
72	298	Western red cedar	40	40	14			ОК	Typical of species, dead wood		1		14	14	14	14	40	40		L
73	299	Douglas fir	46	46	15	No		Poor	Ivy @ root crown up to 50', abnormal bark, carpenter ants bark only, previous top loss, elongated branches, low live crown ratio - 15%, popping bark * soil failure, imminent risk of failure			1	15	15	15	15	0			NS
74	300	Western red cedar	15	15	11			ОК	Exposed roots, typical of species		1		11	11	11	11	15	15		S
75	301	Bigleaf maple	15	15	12			OK	Moss and lichen, suppressed canopy, typical of species		1		12	12	12	12	15	15		S
76	302	Bigleaf maple	18	18	14			OK	Suppressed canopy, moss and lichen, asymmetric canopy to west		1		14	14	14	14	18	18		S
77	303	Bigleaf maple	12	12	15			Poor	Self-corrected lean, large cavity on west @ 6' to 15'			1	15	15	15	15	0			NS
78	304	Bigleaf maple	24	24	18			OK	Moss and lichen, typical of species, dead wood, suppressed canopy		1		18	18	18	18	24	24		S
79	305	Bigleaf maple	23	23	16			OK	Cavity @ root crown up to 8' on east, moss and lichen, narrow canopy, suppressed canopy	1			16	16	16	16	23	23	23	S
80	306	Douglas fir	35	35	22		Yes	Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 45', abnormal bark, shedding bark, carpenter ants bark only, previous top loss, elongated branch, low live crown ratio - 10%, OK in grove	1			22	22	22	22	35	35	35	L

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Prop	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	PZ/LOD)		a.	e	ž
						_	e e							Radius	in feet	: 	υ U	Value	Valu	dma
#	Tree Tag	Species	DBH	Adj. DBH	Drip- line	-firn	grov	Health	Defects/Comments	Via	اله ال						Valu	овн ∨	ЭВН	/Lan
#	#	ID	(in)	(in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	пеаш	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DE	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
		Bigleaf							Exposed roots, cavity on west @ root crown up to 3',											
81	307	maple	20	20	16			Fair	cavity @ root crown up to 11' on west, asymmetric canopy to north	1			16	16	16	16	20	20	20	S
82	309	Bigleaf maple	24	24	0			Poor	Mostly dead * structural defect			1	0	0	0	0	0			NS
83	310	Bigleaf	19	15	16			OK	Typical of species, dead scaffold, dead wood, codominant canopy, cavity on		1		16	16	16	16	19	19		S
85	310	maple	19	13	10			OK .	west, vertical crack 8' to 13' on north		1		10	10	10	10	19	19		3
84	311	Bigleaf maple	21	18	16			ОК	Moss and lichen, co- dominant leaders with included bark x3 reduced to 2 @ 8', 6" trunk fused to main trunk @ 8', typical of species, moss and lichen, cavity @ 1' to 3' on north		1		16	16	16	16	21	21		S
85	312	Bigleaf maple	12	12	15			Fair	Exposed roots, gall @ root crown on west, dead wood, dead scaffold, suppressed canopy		1		15	15	15	15	12	12		S
86	313	Bigleaf maple	24	24	17			Fair	Exposed roots, moss and lichen, dead wood, dead scaffold, suppressed canopy		1		17	17	17	17	24	24		S
87	314	Bigleaf maple	27	27	22			Good	Ivy @ root crown up to 25', typical of species		1		22	22	22	22	27	27		S
88	315	Bigleaf maple	24	24	20			Poor	Ivy @ root crown up to 20', exposed roots, dead wood, dead scaffold, large cavity @ 3' to 15' * 12' long cavity of decay, structural defect			1	20	20	20	20	0			NS

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TP	Z/LOD)			υ	ź
							a)			РТОР	oseu A	CLIOII		Radius	in feet	:		alue	/alu	Imar
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	Jrov			Via	ble						/alue) Į	ВН	Lanc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
89	316	Douglas fir	64	64	22			OK	Ivy @ root crown up to 50', abnormal bark, shedding bark, popping bark, carpenter ants bark only, previous top loss, elongated branches, difficult to access due to heavy ivy, probably OK in grove		1		22	22	22	22	64	64		L
90	317	Douglas fir	60	60	24			ОК	Ivy @ root crown up to 50', dead wood, dead twigs, previous top loss, elongated branches, abnormal bark, shedding bark, carpenter ants bark only, difficult to access, probably OK		1		24	24	24	24	60	60		L
91	318	Bigleaf maple	23	23	21			ОК	Moss and lichen, typical of species, ivy @ root crown up to 40', dead wood, dead scaffold, OK in grove		1		21	21	21	21	23	23		S
92	319	Bigleaf maple	18	18	22 west only	No	Yes	Fair	Moss and lichen, asymmetric canopy to west, dead wood, broken branches, typical of species, OK in grove * Soil failure imminent hazard			1	0	22	0	0	0			NS
93	320	Bigleaf maple	20, 18, 14	52	0			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, mostly dead *almost dead, obvious hazard, structural defect			1	0	0	0	0	0			NS
94	321	Bigleaf maple	17	17	16		Yes	Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 35', suppressed canopy, typical of species		1		16	16	16	16	17	17		S
95	322	Bigleaf maple	32	32	24			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 45' suppressed canopy, typical			1	24	24	24	24	0			NS

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										D				CRZ/TF	Z/LOD				d)	~
							a)			Prop	osed A	ction		Radius	in feet			lue	/alue	mar
	Tree			Adj.	Drip-	Ē	rove			Via	ble						lue	ı Va	\ H	and
#	Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	DBH (in)	line radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	V	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
									large hole on side, structural defect											
96	323	Bigleaf maple	31	31	38			Poor	Large failure with decay @ 12' on north * 1/2 of the tree has already fallen off, structural defect			1	38	38	38	38	0			NS
97	324	Bigleaf maple	27	27	18 north only			Poor	Cavity @ root crown, cavity @ 3' to 5', previous top loss, previous large trunk loss, dead wood * 2' hole in tree, dying structural defect			1	18	0	0	0	0			NS
98	326	Bigleaf maple	19	19	20			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 50', typical of species, ivy to top of tree * tree only supported by ivy - if ivy is removed tree falls, structural defect			1	20	20	20	20	0			NS
99	327	Bigleaf maple	17	17	12			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 50', low live crown ratio, ivy to top of tree * very little living canopy, held up by ivy, tree at high risk of failure in wind, structural defect			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS
100	328	Bigleaf maple	24	24	14			Fair	failure in wind, structural defect Ivy @ root crown up to 50', asymmetric canopy to east, ivy to top of tree * tree			1	14	14	14	14	0			NS
101	329	Bigleaf maple	26	26	18			Poor	Large cavity @ root crown on east, exposed roots, failing on south, ivy @ root crown to top of tree *tree only held upright by ivy,			1	18	18	18	18	0			NS

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	.1			12	2	
										Prop	osed A	ction			PZ/LOD in feet			lue	alue	mark
#	Tree Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	Adj. DBH (in)	Drip- line radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for mprovement	Hazardous	N	w	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
									tree at high risk of failure structural defect		Re imp	H							R	Si
102	330	Bigleaf maple	13	13	0			Poor	Failing on north, ivy @ root crown to top of tree 65' *tree actively falling, at high risk of failure structural defect			1	0	0	0	0	0			NS
103	331	Bigleaf maple	13	13	12			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to top of tree 60' * tree held up by ivy only puts it at high risk of failure structural defect			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS
104	333	Bigleaf maple	14	14	14			Fair	Cavity @ root crown up to 3' on west, suppressed canopy, typical of species, ivy @ root crown up to 25', OK in grove		1		14	14	14	14	14	14		S
105	334	Bigleaf maple	12	12	15			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 35', dead wood, dead scaffold		1		15	15	15	15	12	12		S
106	335	Alder	13	13	14			Fair	Exposed roots, ivy @ root crown up to 35', low live crown ratio - 10%, dead wood, broken branches * short lived tree with only 10% living tissue, structural defect			1	14	14	14	14	0			NS
107	336	Bigleaf maple	12	12	12			Fair	Cavity @ 4' on west, ivy @ root crown up to top of tree, low live crown ratio - 10% * short lived tree with only 10% living tissue structural defect			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS

1	2	3	4	5	6		7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD)			au	¥
							a)			РГОР	oseu A	LIOII		Radius	in feet			alue	/alu	mar
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	rov			Via	ble						alue	×	BH \	-anc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
108	337	Bigleaf maple	13	13	14 west only			Fair	Lean to east canopy, asymmetric canopy to west only, self-corrected lean, dead wood, broken branches * leaning tree with limbs only on one side - given to failure especially during wet snow. Soil failure imminent structural defect			1	0	14	0	0	0			NS
109	338	Bigleaf maple	24	24	18			ОК	Ivy @ root crown up to 15', cavity @ 18 on east, typical of species, moss and lichen	1			18	18	18	18	24	24	24	S
110	339	Bigleaf maple	15	15	16 north only			Poor	Mostly dead, co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 reduced to 1 @ 10'* nearly dead, already lost 1/2 of tree at 10' structural defect			1	16	0	0	0	0			NS
111	340	Bigleaf maple	23	23	18			Fair	Ivy @ root crown up to 40', moss and lichen, dead wood, cavity @ root crown up to 15' on west, dead scaffold, previous top loss	1			18	18	18	18	23	23	23	S
112	341	Bigleaf maple	25	25	17			Poor	Decay @ root crown on west, ivy @ root crown to top of tree 70', dead wood, dead scaffold * Tree supported by ivy only, top down die back structural defect			1	17	17	17	17	0			NS
113	342	Bigleaf maple	24	24	14			Fair	Ivy @ root crown to top of tree, asymmetric canopy to north	1			14	14	14	14	24	24	24	S
114	343	Bigleaf maple	9, 6	15	15			Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 3', ivy @ root crown to top of tree, broken branches, dead wood				15	15	15	15	15	15	15	S
115	345	Bigleaf maple	46	46	0			Poor	Dead * obviously structural defect			1	0	0	0	0	0			NS

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	.1			12	2	
										Prop	osed A	rtion		CRZ/TF	PZ/LOD)			Ф	논
							a			гтор	oseu Ai	LIOII		Radius	in feet			alue	/alu	Imai
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	grov			Via	ble						/alue) F	BH	Lanc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
116	346	Bigleaf maple	86	86	40			Fair	Previous large scaffold failure, dead wood, dead twigs * 1/2 of tree dead and failed, tree in structural defect			1	40	40	40	40	0			NS
117	351	Bigleaf maple	42	42	18			Fair	Large cavity @ root crown up to 4' on west, column of decay @ 4', dead wood, broken branches, ivy @ root crown up to 25', previous failure	1			18	18	18	18	42	42	42	L
118	352	Bigleaf maple	15	15	0			Poor	Dead * obviously structural defect			1	0	0	0	0	0			NS
119	353	Bigleaf maple	21	21	16			Fair	Large cavity @ root crown to 12' on east, hypoxylon canker	1			16	16	16	16	21	21	21	S
120	354	Bigleaf maple	14	14	17			Fair	Ivy @ root crown to top of tree, previous top loss	1			17	17	17	17	14	14	14	S
121	354	Bigleaf maple	14	14	17			Fair	Ivy @ root crown to top of tree, previous top loss		1		17	17	17	17	14	14		S
122	356	Bigleaf maple	20	20	14			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 reduced to 1 @ 6', mostly dead * Mostly dead tree, structural defect			1	14	14	14	14	0			NS
123	366	Bigleaf maple	12	12	12 south only			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x4 @ root crown reduced to 1, mostly dead * mostly dead tree structural defect			1	0	0	0	12	0			NS
124	367	Bigleaf maple	10, 10, 12, 14, 14,	74	15			Poor	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x6 @ root crown, mostly dead * mostly dead tree - structural defect			1	15	15	15	15	0			NS
125	368	Bigleaf maple	8, 8, 12, 12	40	16		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x4 @ root crown, topped @ 30', dead scaffolds, dead twigs, dead wood	1			16	16	16	16	40	40	40	S

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	-	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Dron	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD	l			a	논
							υ			гтор	oseu Ai	CCIOII		Radius	in feet		a)	DBH Value	Valu	Imai
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	in grove			Via	ble						alue	Ν̈́	ВН	Lanc
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in g	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DB	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
126	369	Bigleaf maple	15	15	17		Yes	Fair	Previously topped @ 20', strong laterals, dead wood	1			17	17	17	17	15	15	15	S
127	370	Bigleaf maple	10	10	16 east only		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 20', previously topped @ 20', asymmetric canopy to east	1			0	16	0	0	10	10	10	S
128	371	Western red cedar	9	9	7			OK	Typical of species, recently limbed @ 8'	1			7	7	7	7	9	9	9	S
129	372	Bigleaf maple	7, 5, 7	19	6		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ 1', decay @ crotch, suppressed canopy, typical of species	1			6	6	6	6	19	19	19	S
130	373	Bigleaf maple	10, 11	21	11		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 4', low live crown ratio - 10%, dead wood, dead scaffold, asymmetric canopy to east	1			11	11	11	11	21	21	21	S
131	374	Bigleaf maple	8, 8, 9	25	14 east only		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ 2', low live crown ratio - 10%, asymmetric canopy to east, suppressed canopy	1			0	14	0	0	25	25	25	S
132	375	Western red cedar	6	6	6			Good	Typical of species	1			6	6	6	6	6	6	6	S
133	376	Bigleaf maple	6, 11	17	12			Poor	Taps hollow, mostly dead, co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 3' * mostly dead from internal decay,			1	12	12	12	12	0			NS
134	377	Bigleaf maple	8, 12, 14	34	16		Yes	Fair	Dead scaffold, dead trunk, dead wood, broken branches	1			16	16	16	16	34	34	34	S
135	378	Douglas fir	14	14	12			ОК	Self-corrected lean to				14	14	14	14	14	14	14	S
136	379	Western red cedar	12	12	12			ОК	Typical of species	1			12	12	12	12	12	12	12	S
137	380	Douglas fir	8	8	10			OK	Typical of species, dead wood, broken branches	1			10	10	10	10	8	8	8	S

Susan Prince

Creative Landscape Solutions

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	2	
										Prop	osed A	ction		CRZ/TF	Z/LOD				Ф	논
						_	a			ттор	oseu A	CCIOII		Radius	in feet		ø)	alue	Valu	dmai
,,	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	-firm	grov		5.6.1.6	Via	ble						Value) H	ВН	Land
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	∨ нво	Viable DBH Value	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
138	381	Douglas fir	6	6	6			Fair	Suppressed canopy, low live crown ratio - 5%	1			6	6	6	6	6	6	6	S
139	382	Douglas fir	6	6	6			Fair	Suppressed canopy, low live crown ratio - 5%	1			6	6	6	6	6	6	6	S
140	384	Bigleaf maple	10	10	15			ОК	Typical of species	1			15	15	15	15	10	10	10	S
141	394	Bigleaf maple	10	10	10		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 6', low live crown ratio - 10%, OK in grove	1			10	10	10	10	10	10	10	S
142	396	Bigleaf maple	39	39	16			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x4 @ 5', dead wood, dead scaffold, OK with pruning	1			16	16	16	16	39	39	39	L
143	567	Douglas fir	34	34	17			ок	Co-dominant leaders with included bark X2 @ 15', spur @ 15', dead wood, dead twigs, column of decay, 12-18 sap, horizontal crack in bark, wire imbedded at 11', slight coning, free flowing san @ 15'	1			17	17	17	17	34	34	34	L
144	568	Yellow willow	13	13	15			Poor	horizontal crack in bark, wire imbedded at 11', slight coning, free flowing sap @ 15' Cavity root crown to 4' * 4' hole in tree; tree in permanent decline and at high risk of failure *			1	15	15	15	15	0			NS
145	569	Colorado blue spruce	15	15	10			Poor	Dead * obviously structural defect			1	10	10	10	10	0			NS
146	570	Horse chestnut	22	22	17			OK	Typical of species, Carpenter ants, woodpecker activity, swing set chains embedded in limb,		1		17	17	17	17	22	22		S

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1			12	1	
										Prop	osed A	ction		CRZ/TP				d)	ne	ark
						_	ø			·				Radius	in feet		a)	Value	Valı	dmg
	Tree	Species	DBH	Adj.	Drip- line	firm	grove			Via							alue	> H	ВН	Land
#	Tag #	ID	(in)	DBH (in)	radius (ft)	Wind-firm	5 ui XO	Health	Defects/Comments	Retain	Remove for improvement	Hazardous	N	W	Е	S	DBH Value	Viable DBH	Retained DBH Value	Significant/Landmark
147	571	Catalpa	8	8	14			Fair	Abnormal bark, shedding bark, carpenter ants, dead wood, broken branch's		1		14	14	14	14	8	8		S
148	572	Catalpa	24	24	18			ОК	Typical of species, cavity 1' to 10' south	1			18	18	18	18	24	24	24	S
149	573	Plum	7,6	13	8			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark X 2 @ root crown, typical of species, anthracnose	1			8	8	8	8	13	13	13	S
150	898	Bigleaf maple	20	20	17			Fair	Tree is half dead, top is dead, dead scaffold. Moss and lichen * 1/2 of the tree is already dead, tree is in structural defect			1	9	9	9	9	0			NS
151	899	Bigleaf maple	24	24	14			Poor	Dead top, dead scaffolds, moss and lichen * tree dying from top down likely a root issue, disease			1	14	14	14	14	0			NS
										30	64	57					1983	1983	596	

Offsite potentially impacted trees:

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1	
										Proi	osed	Action			PZ/LO	
#	Tree Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	Adj. DBH (in)	Drip- line radius (ft)	Wind- firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Viable	Non- viable	Remove	N	Radius W	in fee	S
1	A	Western red cedar	44	44	16			ОК	Typical of species, 3' from fence line, previous top loss	1			16	16	16	16
2	В	Western red cedar	37	37	14			ОК	8' from fence line, typical of species	1			14	14	14	14
3	С	Bigleaf maple	32	32	15			Poor	Mostly dead		1		15	15	15	15
4	D	Western red cedar	45	45	10			Fair	Nurse tree, large cavity in center of tree @ root crown, woodpecker activity, carpenter ants		1		10	10	10	10
5	E	Bigleaf maple	18, 14	23	22 west only			Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, exposed roots, moss and lichen, girdling root, asymmetric canopy to west, lean to south		1		22	22	22	22
6	F	Western red cedar	27, 16, 18	36	14			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, typical of species	1			14	14	14	14
7	G	Bigleaf maple	32	32	20			ОК	Typical of species, cavity @ 15' to 18' on north	1			20	20	20	20
8	Н	Bigleaf maple	50	50	30			Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 4', large cavity on north @ root crown to 16', dead scaffold, OK in grove		1		30	30	30	30

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1	
										Pro	posed	Action			PZ/LO in fee	
#	Tree Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	Adj. DBH (in)	Drip- line radius (ft)	Wind- firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Viable	Non- viable	Remove	N	W	E	S
9	I	Western red cedar	18	18	9			Good	Typical of species	1			9	9	9	9
10	J	Douglas fir	24	24	14			Good	Self-corrected lean, typical of species, dead wood, broken branches	1			14	14	14	14
11	К	Western red cedar	10	10	9			Good	Typical of species	1			9	9	9	9
12	225	Dawn redwood	25	25	15		Yes	Fair	Dead spur @ root crown, asymmetric canopy to west, typical of species grown in shade	1			15	15	15	15
13	226	Dawn redwood	21	21	15		Yes	Fair	Typical of species grown in shade, dead wood, broken branches, asymmetric canopy to west	1			15	15	15	15
14	227	Dawn redwood	11, 8, 18	22.5	16		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x3 @ root crown, girdling rope @ 8', dead spur, carpenter ants bark only, column of decay on east	1			16	16	16	16
15	228	Dawn redwood	26	26	18			ОК	Carpenter ants bark only, previous top loss, typical of species	1			18	18	18	18
16	232	Dawn redwood	22	22	13			ОК	Typical of species, slight lean- to north	1			13	13	13	13
17	233	Cedar variety	9	9	10		Yes	Fair	Thin canopy, OK with light	1			10	10	10	10

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	,	8	9		10			1	1	
										Pro	posed	Action			PZ/LO	
#	Tree Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	Adj. DBH (in)	Drip- line radius (ft)	Wind- firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Viable	Non- viable	Remove	N	W	in fee	S
18	287	Alder	8	8	10			Fair	Previous top loss, lean on north, asymmetric canopy to north, moss and lichen		1		10	10	10	10
19	296	Alder	13, 4	13.5	11			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, typical of species, dead wood	1			11	11	11	11
20	308	Bigleaf maple	29	29	16			ОК	Ivy @ root crown up to 20', typical of species	1			16	16	16	16
21	332	Bigleaf maple	23	23	16			Fair	Ivy @ root crown to top of tree, cavity on south @ root crown to 4', lean to west		1		16	16	16	16
22	285	Alder	16	16	16			ОК	Typical of species, dead wood, broken branches	1			16	16	16	16
23	286	Alder	8	8	12			ОК	Typical of species, dead wood, broken branches	1			12	12	12	12
24	380	Douglas fir	8	8	10			ОК	Typical of species, dead wood, broken branches	1			10	10	10	10
25	383	Bigleaf maple	10, 8, 8, 8	17	15			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x4 @ root crown, cavity on north, typical of species	1			15	15	15	15
26	384	Bigleaf maple	10	10	15			ОК	Typical of species	1			15	15	15	15
27	385	Bigleaf maple	5, 8, 10, 6	15	15			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x4 @ root crown, 1 trunk dead, girdled by barb wire, typical of species, OK in grove	1			15	15	15	15

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9		10			1	1	
										Proj	posed	Action		RZ/TI Radius		
#	Tree Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	Adj. DBH (in)	Drip- line radius (ft)	Wind- firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Viable	Non- viable	Remove	N	W	Е	S
28	386	Bigleaf maple	10	10	15			Fair	Cavity @ 1' to 4', OK in grove		1		15	15	15	15
29	387	Bigleaf maple	9, 4	10	15		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, girdled by barb wire, mostly dead, OK in grove	1			15	15	15	15
30	388	Bigleaf maple	10, 6	11.5	15			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, typical of species	1			15	15	15	15
31	389	Bigleaf maple	12, 9, 9, 9, 9	22.5	15			ОК	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x5 @ root crown, girdled root, girdled with barb wire, typical of species	1			15	15	15	15
32	390	Bigleaf maple	8	8	15			Poor	Mostly dead, co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 reduced to 1, girdled barb wire		1		15	15	15	15
33	391	Bigleaf maple	10, 9, 8, 6, 6	18	15			Poor	Girdled with barb wire, co- dominant leaders with included bark x5 @ root crown, mostly dead		1		15	15	15	15
34	392	Bigleaf maple	6, 9	11	15			Fair	Girdled with barb wire, codominant leaders with included bark x2 @ 3', OK in grove		1		15	15	15	15

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	7	8	9	10		11						
													Proposed Action			CRZ/TPZ/LOD Radius in feet		
#	Tree Tag #	Species ID	DBH (in)	Adj. DBH (in)	Drip- line radius (ft)	Wind- firm	OK in grove	Health	Defects/Comments	Viable	Non- viable	Remove	N	W	Е	S		
35	393	Bigleaf maple	4, 10, 9, 10	17	17		Yes	Fair	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x6 @ root crown, dead scaffold, dead trunks, could be pruned, OK in grove	1			17	17	17	17		
36	395	Bigleaf maple	18, 15	23.5	15			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x2 @ root crown, girdled wire, typical of species, asymmetric canopy to north, dead wood, broken branches	1			15	15	15	15		
37	397	Douglas fir	12	12	12			OK	Previous top loss, elongated branches, dead twigs, moss and lichen	1			12	12	12	12		
38	398	Bigleaf maple	59	59	16 north only			OK	Co-dominant leaders with included bark x5 @ 4', 2 dead trunks, dead wood, dead scaffold, hanger, asymmetric canopy to north, OK if pruned	1			16	0	0	0		

28 10 0

Site:



Proposed site improvements:



Discussion about the Hazard Trees onsite:

Since the original study of the trees was completed four years ago, the ISA has moved from numerical system of determine the risk of tree failure (1 being a tree at low risk of failure, 13 being a tree in the process of failure). This original method of quantifying risk was based on totally the number of defects a tree had and assigning a number to indicate the level of risk the tree posed if it were to fail. This system included a numbering system from 1-4 that addressed the target the failing tree might hit.

More recently the ISA has adopted a new criteria that continues to take into account the defects of the tree, but also includes the soil conditions, and previous impacts (e.g. paving over the roots) as well as the "value" of the target if the tree were to fail (a low target environment would be a tree that fails in the woods that causes no damage to the environment, a high target area would be a day care center or hospital with people being present most of the time.

It is sometimes difficult to move between the older and newer criteria in tree risk assessment. However, in this case each tree was assessed using a Level 2 tree risk assessment, making the transition between the two methods easy, as the final assessment is generally done offsite, when I can determine the quantity of defects (see column entitled "Defects/Comments").

Currently the trees at high risk of failure have no target so in ISA terminology cannot be considered "hazardous" only at high risk of failure.

Once the trees are shown overlaid the proposed site plan, it is easy to see that nearly all the trees have housing as a target except for trees 366 and 367. They may be retained however, because of the poor condition they are in no tree credits should be given them.

It is important, I think, when performing a study such as this, to bear in mind that forests begin when "pioneer" species trees see into sunny wet areas. As the name implies, these trees are first to become established in an area. Their seedlings require full sun to germinate. The trees grown quickly and devote very little of the resources to compartmentalizing decay (to stop it from killing the tree). Because they have little defense to insects and injury, they are short-lived trees. The pioneer species include: Cottonwood, red alder, black locust (Robinia), Ash and to some extent Bigleaf maple etc. Their purpose in the ecosystem to grow quickly, provide shade necessary for "climax" species trees to germinate. By the time the climax species trees begin the shade the sun-loving pioneers, they are dying and providing nutrients to the soil to aid the longer-lived trees. These slow growing trees expend a lot of their resources fighting infection and decay.

I have included the % of trees currently deemed as "high risk" trees:

% Hazard trees by species					
Species	No. of trees	%			
Bigleaf maple	30	71%			
Alder	5	12%			
Ash	1	2%			
Bitter cherry	1	2%			
Colorado blue spruce	1	2%			
Incense cedar	1	2%			
Norway spruce	1	2%			
Western red cedar	1	2%			

% Hazard trees by species						
Yellow willow	1	2%				
	42	97%				

As might be expected, 89% of the trees assessed as being at high risk of failure are pioneer species trees. In the next few decades, the evergreen climax species trees will overtake the site. Were that to occur, the total number of trees in poor condition would be expected to drastically decline.

In mitigating a site such as this one, where there is a desire for increased canopy cover, the goal can be met by planting native species that would normally be present in higher quantities in the next few decades.

Discussion and Conclusion:

Tree Density Calculation				
	10.02.20			
Total number of trees counted outside critical areas	149			
Total number of hazard trees	55			
Total number of significant trees	94			
Total number of retained trees proposed	30			
Total number of tree credits	1978			
Required tree density (1983*.30)	594			
Total number of retained tree credits proposed	596			
Required mitigation	0			

The 4.9-acre Mine Hill site is located south of Sunset Way and west of Front Street. The parcel is divided by a small creek running north and south at the bottom of a steep slope. On the east side of the creek are several existing homes, on the west side is a single existing home. Proposed site improvements include a dividing the site into 15 individual lots with townhomes and single-family residence.

The site has a total of 149 trees on it, (excluding trees in critical area). Ninety-four (94) trees are significant and thirty (30) are proposed to be retained. There are 1978 DBH total inches on the site (excluding hazardous trees and those trees in critical areas). The city requires that the applicant retain 30% of those tree inches (1978 * 30%) which equals 594 DBH inches. The site proposal retains 596 tree credits. No mitigation is necessary.

Mitigation: 0 trees

Discussion and Conclusion:

This site is heavily encumbered by critical slope and wetland. The site is divided by a deep ravine with a small creek at the bottom. There are currently several abandoned homes and outbuildings on the lot. The property was logged many years ago and currently is mostly populated primarily with pioneer species trees – deciduous trees that grow quickly, are short-lived and presumed adapted to an environment where they die and decompose to provide shade and nutrients for more slow growing conifers.

On this site, the trees have been compromised further (beyond their biological susceptibility to decay) by the wet soil surrounding the creek, as well as, the fact that many are heavily covered with invasive species plant material (English ivy and Himalayan blackberry). Many of the long-neglected trees remain standing only because they are supported by ropes of English ivy.

The proposed site plan is driven by the grading necessary to build the access road, several clusters of the viable trees need to be removed for the installation of utilizes and roadway access. Reducing the number of lots does little to add to the total number of trees retained.

Mark-up summary from RFI:

- 1. Comment: Please identify the number of hazardous trees present on the site. This number should be shown, but not included in retention or removal calculations. **Completed:** Onsite tree spreadsheet has been updated to show the hazardous trees without contributing any tree credits.
- 2. Per IMC, if the site is below the minimum tree density number, trees must be added to the site. Please clarify and or revise. **Completed:** The original submittal only considered viable trees (with the expectation that they remain healthy for at least a decade. It did not include trees rated in fair condition toward the total number of site trees. This report has been updated to include those trees that were not actually dead, or mostly dead into the total tree number; by raising the total number of tree credits for the site, this in turn raised the % of trees that need to retained as that number fell below the minimum, mitigation trees are required.
- **3.** Please add the likelihood of impact, consequences of failure, and overall tree risk rating assessments to hazardous trees as listed in the most recent adopted IDA standard tree risk assessment evaluation. **Completed:** Please see the updated section entitled "Hazard Trees"
- **4.** The DBH for all viable trees, except for trees that are poor (aka hazardous), must be provided and included in the tree calculations. **Completed:** Please see comments on question 1 and 2.
- **5.** Health condition for this tree (319) has not been identified. Please revise. **Completed:** Spreadsheet has been updated.
- **6.** The construction of the retaining wall will most likely impact existing trees on the adjacent property. Please provide a letter or document from the property owner providing consent with the removal of these trees. Also, what measures are recommended to keep these trees from being impacted. **Completed:** Retaining wall was removed.

Glossary:

ANSI A300: American National Standards Institute (ANSI) standards for tree care

Chlorotic: discoloration caused by lack of chlorophyll in the foliage

Conifer: A tree that bears cones and has evergreen needles or scales

Crown: the above ground portion of the tree comprised of branches and their foliage

Crown raise pruning: a pruning technique where the lower branches are removed, thus raising the overall height of the crown from the ground

DBH or DSH: diameter at breast or standard height; the diameter of the trunk measured 54 inches (4.5 feet) above grade

Deciduous: tree or other plant that loses its leaves annually and remains leafless generally during the cold season

Epicormic: arising from latent or adventitious buds

Evergreen: tree or plant that keeps its needles or leaves year-round; this means for more than one growing season

Increment: the amount of new wood fiber added to a tree in each period, normally one year.

ISA: International Society of Arboriculture

Landscape function: the environmental, aesthetic, or architectural functions that a plant can have

Lateral: secondary or subordinate branch

Limits of disturbance: The boundary of minimum protection around a tree, the area that cannot be encroached upon without possible permanent damage to the tree. It is a distance determined by a qualified professional and is based on the age of the tree, its health, the tree species tolerance to disruption and the type of disturbance. It also considers soil and environmental condition and previous impacts. It is unique to each tree in its location.

Limited visual assessment: a visual assessment from a specified perspective such as foot, vehicle, or aerial (airborne) patrol of an individual tree or a population of trees near specified targets to identify specified conditions or obvious defects (ISA 2013)

Live crown ratio: the percentage of living tissue in the canopy versus the tree's height. It is a good indicator of overall tree health and the trees growing conditions. Trees with less than a 30% Crown ratio often lack the necessary quantity of photosynthetic material necessary to sustain the roots; consequently, the tree may exhibit low vigor and poor health.

Monitoring: keeping a close watch; performing regular checks or inspections

Owner/manager: the person or entity responsible for tree management or the controlling authority that regulates tree management

Pathogen: causal agent of disease

Phototropic growth: growth toward light source or stimulant

ROW: Right-of-way; generally referring to a tree that is located offsite on a city easement

- Reaction wood: Specialized secondary xylem which develops in response to a lean or similar mechanical stress, it serves to help restore the stem to a vertical position
- Self-corrected lean: a tree whose trunk is at an angle to the grade but whose trunk and canopy changes to become upright/vertical
- Significant tree: a tree measuring a specific diameter determined by the municipality the tree grows in. Some municipalities deem that only healthy trees can be significant, other municipalities consider both healthy and unhealthy trees of a determined diameter to be significant
- Snag: a tree left partially standing for the primary purpose of providing habitat for wildlife
- Soil structure: the size of particles and their arrangement; considers the soil, water, and air space
- Sounding: process of striking a tree with a mallet or other appropriate tool and listening for tones that indicate dead bark, a thin layer of wood outside a cavity, or cracks in wood
- Structural defects: flaws, decay, or other faults in the trunk, branches, or root collar of a tree, which may lead to failure; may be genetic, or environmental
- Tree credit: A number assigned to a tree by a municipality that may be equal to the diameter of the tree or a numerical count of the tree, or related to diameter by a factor conveyed in a table of the municipal code
- Trunk area: the cross-sectional area of the trunk based upon measurement at 54 inches (4.5 ft.) above grade
- Visual Tree Assessment (VTA): method of evaluating structural defects and stability in trees by noting the pattern of growth. Developed by Claus Mattheck (Harris, et al 1999) detailed visual inspection of a tree and surrounding site that may include the use of simple tools. It requires that a tree risk assessor walk completely around the tree trunk looking at the site, aboveground roots, trunk, and branches (ISA 2013)

References

- Dirr, Michael A. <u>Manual of Woody Landscape Plants, Their Identification, Ornamental Characteristics, Culture, Propagation, and Uses</u>. Champaign: Stipes Publishing Company, 1990.
- Dunster & Associates Environmental Consultants Ltd. <u>Assessing Trees in Urban Areas and the Urban-Rural Interface.</u> US Release 1.0. Silverton: Pacific Northwest Chapter ISA, 2006.
- Dunster, J. A. 2003. <u>Preliminary Species Profiles for Tree Failure Assessment.</u> Bowen Island: Dunster & Associates Environmental Consultants Ltd.
- Dunster, Julian A., E. Thomas Smiley, Nelda Matheny and Sharon Lilly. <u>Tree Risk Assessment Manual.</u> Champaign, Illinois: International Society of Arboriculture, 2013.
- Harris, Richard W, James Clark, and Nelda Matheny. <u>Arboriculture, Integrated Management of Landscape Trees, Shrubs, and Vines</u>. 4th ed. Upper Saddle River: Prentice Hall, 2004.
- Lilly, Sharon. <u>Arborists' Certification Study Guide.</u> Champaign, IL: The International Society of Arboriculture, 2001.
- Matheny, Nelda and Clark, James R. <u>A Photographic Guide to the Evaluation of Hazard Trees in Urban Areas.</u> Second Edition. Champaign, IL: The International Society of Arboriculture, 1994.
- Matheny, Nelda and Clark, James R. <u>Trees and Development: A Technical Guide to Preservation of Trees During Land Development.</u> Champaign, IL: The International Society of Arboriculture, 1998.
- Mattheck, Claus and Breloer, Helge. <u>The Body Language of Trees: A Handbook for Failure Analysis.</u> London: HMSO, 1994
- Schwarze, Francis W.M.R. <u>Diagnosis and Prognosis of the Development of Wood Decay in Urban Trees.</u>
 Australia: ENSPEC Pty Ltd. 2008
- Sinclair, Wayne A., Lyon, Howard H., and Johnson, Warren T. <u>Diseases of Trees and Shrubs</u>. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1987.
- Smiley, E. Thomas, Nelda Matheny, and Sharon Lilly, Tree Risk Assessment Best Management Practices, ANSI A300 Part 9: Tree, Shrub, and Other Woody Plant Management—Standard Practices (Tree Risk Assessment: Tree Structure Assessment). The International Society of Arboriculture Press. Champaign. IL. 2011.
- Thies, Walter G. and Sturrock, Rona N. *Laminated root rot in Western North American*. United States Department of Agriculture. Pacific Northwest. Resource Bulletin PNW-GTR-349. April 1995.

Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

- 1. Any legal description provided to the consultant/appraiser is assumed to be correct. Any titles and ownerships to any property are assumed to be good and marketable. No responsibility is assumed for matters legal in character. Any and all property is appraised or evaluated as thou free and clear, under responsible ownership and competent management.
- 2. It is assumed that any property is not in violation of any applicable codes, ordinances, statutes or other governmental regulations.
- 3. Care has been taken to obtain all information from reliable sources. All data has been verified insofar as possible; however, the consultant/appraiser can neither guarantee nor be responsible for the accuracy of information provided by others.
- 4. The consultant/appraiser shall not be required to give testimony or to attend court by reason of the report unless subsequent contractual arrangements are made including payment of an additional fee for such services as described in the fee schedule and contract of engagement.
- 5. Loss or alteration of any part of this report invalidates the entire report.
- 6. Possession of this report or a copy thereof does not imply right of publication or use for any purpose by any other than the person to whom it is addressed, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant/appraiser.
- 7. Neither all nor any part of the contents of the report, nor copy thereof, shall be conveyed by anyone, including the client to the public through advertising, public relations, news, sales or other media, without the prior expressed written or verbal consent of the consultant/appraiser particularly as to value conclusions, identity of the consultant/appraiser, or any reference to any professional society or instate or to any initialed designation conferred upon the consultant/appraiser as stated in her qualification.
- The report and any values expressed herein represent the opinion of the consultant/appraiser, and the consultant's/appraiser's fee is in no way contingent upon the reporting of a specified value, a stipulated result, the occurrence of subsequent event, nor upon any finding to be reported.
- Sketches, diagrams, graphs and photographs in this report, being intended as visual aid, are
 not necessarily to scale and should not be construed as engineering or architectural reports or
 survey.
- 10. Unless expressed otherwise: 1) information contained in this report covers only those items that were examined and reflects the condition of those items at the time of inspection; and 2: the inspection is limited to visual examination of accessible items without dissection, excavation, probing or coring. There is not warranty or guarantee, expressed or implied, that problems or deficiencies of the plants or property in question may not arise in the future.